



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/410,334	10/01/1999	AUBREY MCAULEY	ADHE1100	6725

30076 7590 04/03/2003

BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER & STEINER, LLP  
SUITE 711  
1880 CENTURY PARK EAST  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

CHAVIS, JOHN Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

pph

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/410,334

Applicant(s)

MCAULEY, AUBREY

Examiner

John Q. Chavis

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The problem actually exists in claim 1 with the term “objections” on line 8. It is not clear what an “objection in an object library” is. Therefore, the feature is being treated as “object”, as in the previous action. The dependent claims inherit the defects of its respective parent claim. Furthermore, appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8, 11-18, 20-21, 25-40, 42-44, 47, 50-51 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewandowski (PTO-1449 reference U) and further in view of the applicant's background acknowledgement of prior art. The applicant's invention pertains to a method and system of generating computer applications from a framework. The invention, specifically (for example, claim 1) merely appears to consist of having a program developer enter selective data (form, content and functionality) in separate objects; which is

Art Unit: 2124

considered inherent in Johnson's system (as previously indicated). However, the previous rejection and response is considered moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The features of the applicant's claims are now presented in a side-by-side manner with the teachings of Lewandowski/Admitted prior art.

### Claims

— 1. A method for generating computer application on a host system in an arbitrary object framework that separates a content of said computer application, a form of said computer application and a functionality of said computer applications, said method comprising:

creating arbitrary objects with corresponding arbitrary names of various object types for generating said content of said computer application, said form of said computer application, and said functionality of said computer application;

### Lewandowski/Admitted prior art

see figure 8 (host) and fig. 5 (IDL – form or interface), functionality (page 14, which is separate from the interface (1<sup>st</sup> complete paragraph)), and content (which is considered merely data), Tier three on page 22.

Objects in an object oriented environment are inherently arbitrary to provide for the specific details of the application with corresponding corresponding arbitrary names (see the naming service on page 13) specified to identify and enable access to the specific objects, see again the abstract. Furthermore, see figure 10 on page 22, with it's BLO to generate content (data), Presentation Objects to represent form, and its BPO to represent functionality. Although, it is considered inherent that content is a separate object in Lewandowski's system, the feature may be argued since it is not specifically stated. However, the applicant admits that the feature existed in the prior art on page 3 lines 18-29 to help minimize dependencies between interface designs and the functions they access.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lewandowski's system with the applicant's admitted prior art feature of separating content from form and functionality for the same reasons as they were utilized in the prior art. It would also, as indicated above merely be a design choice to separate the form and function objects.

managing said arbitrary objections in an object library; and

furthermore, objects and functions (functionality) are provided names to enable communication (managing) between objects, via CORBA, page 23. The library feature (framework) enables quick and easy reusability, see the conclusions on page 26 and again see the Introduction for the library feature.

deploying said arbitrary objects from said object library into a design framework to create said computer

see section 5.1.3 on page 16.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein said computer application is a web site.

Lewandowski provides his system as a client/server system, which inherently represents any system that makes requests and provides responses, such a web site.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise text file pointers.

this feature is considered inherent to enable access to specific data items in a database such as "shippable products, see section 5.2.

4. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise binary file pointers.

see again the rejection of claim 3.

5. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise executables.

see again the BPO's in claim 1.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise shell commands.

this feature is considered inherent via the search commands and the Access commands, via the Presentation Objects indicated in claim 1.

7. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise remote procedure calls.

see again the Conclusion, specifically the first paragraph.

8. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise global variables.

this feature is considered inherent in object oriented Systems to identify variables that are generic (common features) to all subclasses and therefore not changed in subclasses. The data that is not overridden is inherently global to the subclass that does not provide it's own definition.

11. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise local variables.

see the discussion in claim 8, the data that is overridden or new in Subclasses are local to the subclass.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise local objects and global parent objects.

see the rejections of claims 8 and 11.

13. The method of claim 12, wherein said local objects can override said global parent objects.

see again the rejections of claims 8 and 11.

14. The method of claim 12, wherein said local objects inherit data from said global parent objects.

see the rejections of claims 8 and 11.

15. The method of claim 1, wherein said local objects inherit capabilities from said global parent objects.

see again the rejection of claims 8 and 11.

16. The method of claim 1, further comprising arbitrary objects globally.

see again the rejection of claims 8 and 11.

17. The method of claim 1, further comprising arbitrary objects locally.

see again the rejection of claims 8 and 11.

18. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of managing said arbitrary Objects further comprises revision tracking.

see the last sentence of the first paragraph of section 3.1.

20. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of managing further comprises using signoff.

This feature is considered inherent via the sign in feature via password Verifications to ensure proper access to stored information in a client/server environment, see section 2.

21. The method of claim 1, wherein said arbitrary objects can be accessed and deployed into said design framework using said corresponding arbitrary names.

see the rejection of claim 1.

25. The method of claim 1, further comprising generating arbitrary objects in a programming language that is compatible or supported by said host system.

This feature is considered inherent in CORBA systems.

The features of claims 26-32 are taught via the rejections of claims 2-8.

As per claims 33-36, see the rejections of claims 11-14.

In reference to claims 37-40, see claims 15-18.

The features of claims 42-44 are taught via claims 20-22.

As per claim 47, see the rejection of claim 25.

In reference to claim 50-51, see the dynamic construction on page 12.

The features of claim 53 are indicated via the object containment feature on page 15.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9-10, 19 and 22-24, 41, 45-46, 48-49, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewandowski in view the applicant's admitted prior art, as cited above,

and further in view of Gish (6,253,282) who teach providing caching to speed access time, using rollback to compensate for errors in subclasses via his event handling means and swapping objects when a different type is required or needed.

Claims

9. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise cached executables.

10. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise cached database queries.

Lewandowski /Gish

Lewandowski does not specifically teach the use of cached executables; However, he teach the use of executables as indicated in the rejection of claim 5. Gish teach the use of a cache, see the abstract, to speed up data access time and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lewandowski's system with Gish's caching of data to increase execution speed.

in reference to the database queries, this is the essence of client/ systems, see section 2.2. In reference to the caching of

19. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of managing said arbitrary objects further comprises using rollback.

data see claim 9.

Although Lewandowski does not specifically indicate that rollback is used, the feature is considered A standard feature for correcting errors to ensure that previous updates are not lost. Gish teach handling events that occur as a program executes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the feature of handling events taught by Gish (col. 36 line 50-col. 38 line 52) in Lewandowski's system when the validator, col. 27 lines 14-15, encounters errors to ensure that previously validated data is not lost. Gish enables the creation of specific handlers and therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a rollback to reduce update time.

22. The method of claim 1, further comprising swapping an arbitrary object of one type with an arbitrary object of another type.

Lewandowski does not specifically teach that objects of one type are swapped for objects of Another type; however, he does indicate that objects are self-managed as needed from the problem domain, section 3.2, and that they function in multiple environments, section 3.3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select different types when different types are needed to solve a specific problem.

23. The method of claim 1, further comprising caching objects.

see the rejections of claim 9 and 10.

Art Unit: 2124

24. The method of claim 23, wherein  
and  
the step of caching objects further  
complete  
comprises specifying some elements  
of an arbitrary object to be dynamic  
elements and specifying some  
elements of said arbitrary to be  
static elements.

see the rejections of claims 9  
10 in view of see the second  
paragraph of page 12.

In reference to claim 41, see the rejection of claim 19.

As per claims 45-46, see the rejection of claims 23-24.

In reference to claim 48-49, see claims 9-10.

The features of claim 52 are taught via claim 24.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Chavis whose telephone number is (703) 305-9665. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki (**New Art Unit 2124**), can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax number for this Group is (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JQC  
March 26, 2003



JOHN CHAVIS  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2124